

### Dependent Claims

The Office Action also rejects claims 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Yoshimatsu '742, Krusche, and Yoshimatsu '266 along with Chung (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,605) and "a further teaching of" Krusche (U.S. Patent No. 4,665,699). Office Action at 4. Claims 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 21 depend from either allowable independent claim 1 or allowable independent claim 15. Therefore, those dependent claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons independent claims 1 and 15 are be allowable.

### Conclusions

For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claims 1 and 15 should be allowable. Dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, and 21 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 15. Consequently, those dependent claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons their corresponding independent claim is allowable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application, the withdrawal of the outstanding claim rejections, and the allowance of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-16, and 21.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation might advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at 571-203-2739.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action contains numerous assertions concerning the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether those

assertions are addressed specifically herein, Applicant respectfully declines to automatically subscribe to them.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 6-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 30, 2004

By:



Christopher T. Kent  
Reg. No. 48,216